



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of

Koji Takahara et al.

Application No.: 10/003,216

Filing Date: December 6, 2001

Title: POLARIZATION CONVERSION OPTICAL SYSTEM AND POLARIZATION CONVERSION ELEMENT

Group Art Unit: 2872

Examiner: CRAIG CURTIS

Confirmation No.: 4993

AMENDMENT/REPLY TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Enclosed is a reply for the above-identified patent application.

☐ A Petition for Extension of Time is also enclosed.☐ Terminal Disclaimer(s) and the ☐ \$65.00 (2814) ☐ \$130.00 (1814) fee per Disclaimer due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.20(d) are also enclosed.☐ Also enclosed is/are _____

_____☐ Small entity status is hereby claimed.☐ Applicant(s) requests continued examination under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 and enclose the ☐ \$395.00 (2801) ☐ \$790.00 (1801) fee due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(e).☐ Applicant(s) requests that any previously unentered after final amendments not be entered. Continued examination is requested based on the enclosed documents identified above.☐ Applicant(s) previously submitted _____

on _____,
for which continued examination is requested.☐ Applicant(s) requests suspension of action by the Office until at least _____, which does not exceed three months from the filing of this RCE, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.103(c). The required fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(i) is enclosed.☐ A Request for Entry and Consideration of Submission under 37 C.F.R. § 1.129(a) (1809/2809) is also enclosed.

- ☒ No additional claim fee is required.
- ☐ An additional claim fee is required, and is calculated as shown below.

AMENDED CLAIMS					
	No. of Claims	Highest No. of Claims Previously Paid For	Extra Claims	Rate	Additional Fee
Total Claims	18	MINUS 20 =	0	x \$50.00 (1202) =	\$ 0.00
Independent Claims	3	MINUS 3 =	0	x \$200.00 (1201) =	\$ 0.00
If Amendment adds multiple dependent claims, add \$360.00 (1203)					\$ 0.00
Total Claim Amendment Fee					\$ 0.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Small Entity Status claimed - subtract 50% of Total Claim Amendment Fee					\$ 0.00
TOTAL ADDITIONAL CLAIM FEE DUE FOR THIS AMENDMENT					\$ 0.00

- ☐ A check in the amount of _____ is enclosed for the fee due.
- ☐ Charge _____ to Deposit Account No. 02-4800.
- ☐ Charge _____ to credit card. Form PTO-2038 is attached.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17, 1.20(d) and 1.21 that may be required by this paper, and to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-4800. This paper is submitted in duplicate.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

By



James A. LaBarre
Registration No. 28,632

Date: June 22, 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of)

Koji Takahara et al.)

Group Art Unit: 2872

Application No.: 10/003,216)

Examiner: CRAIG CURTIS

Filed: December 6, 2001)

Confirmation No.: 4993

For: POLARIZATION CONVERSION
OPTICAL SYSTEM AND
POLARIZATION CONVERSION
ELEMENT)

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated March 24, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims.

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-14 and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103, on the grounds that they were considered to be unpatentable over the newly cited Budd et al. patent (U.S. 6,341,038), in view of the Wentz patent (U.S. 4,515,441) and JP 62-200320 (identified as "Fukushima et al."). The remaining claims were rejected on the basis of these three references, in further view of EP 0 471 109 ("Steiner et al."). It is respectfully submitted that these references do not suggest the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art, whether considered individually or in combination.

Claim 1 recites a polarization conversion optical system that includes, among other elements, a dielectric multilayer film having a different incidence angle dependency relative to a first polarized light component and a second polarized light component having mutually intersecting planes of polarization. The claim recites